

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to claims 6-10 and 17-22.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22, 31, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 23-30 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Applicants respectfully traverse the objections, §101 rejections, and the §112 rejections with the following arguments.

Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 6-10 and 17-22, alleging: "The claims are potentially non-statutory as the claims refer to compute code but not to computer code stored on a computer readable media. Without being stored on a physical media the code is an abstract idea."

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that the objections are moot, because the amended claims claims 6-10 and 17-22 include the feature: "said computer code being stored on a computer readable medium".

35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22, 31, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, alleging "The independent claims (1,6,11,17,31 and 32) state the phrase "said BR1/BR a positive integer". The variable BR1/BR is not defined before this statement."

In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 11, 17, 31, and 32 to replace "said BR1/BR a positive integer" by "BR1/BR being a positive integer". Accordingly, Applicants maintain that claims 1-22, 31, and 32 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claims 23-30 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §101, alleging: "The claims are non-statutory because the claims represent abstract mathematical algorithms".

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that the feature "outputting Z to said output device" (claims 23-26) and "output Z to said output device" (claims 27-30 and 33) is not comprised by an abstract mathematical algorithm". Accordingly, Applicants maintain that claims 23-30 and 33 are not non-statutory under 35 U.S.C. §101.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0457.

Date: 10/19/2004

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850